

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/941,326	ROSCOE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter Poltorak	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. This communication is responsive to communication received on 8/13/06.
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-21,24,26-28,30-38,42-45,54 and 55.
3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some*
 - c) None
 of the:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material
5. Notice of Informal Patent Application
6. Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____.
7. Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. Other _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 2/15/06.
2. Claim 22-23, 25, 29, 39-41, 46-53 and 56 has been canceled.
3. Drawings and amendments to the specification received on 8/13/06 have been accepted

Examiner Amendment

4. An Examiner's Amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to Applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the Issue Fee.

Cancelling claim 56 was authorized by David Ciesielski on 10/12/06.

5. Please cancel claim 56.

Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

6. Claims 1-21, 24, 26-28, 30-38, 42-45 and 54-55 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter.

7. Applicant invention is directed towards managing communication between involving a service component in a computing environment wherein a trustworthiness and criticality measure of service components determines whether the interconnection between the service components should be allowed.

8. The closest prior art Wiegel (U.S. Patent No. 6484261) discloses filtering interconnection communication involving service components. The filtering is based on defined policies. Pfleeger (Charles P. Pfleeger, "Security in Computing", ISBN 0133374866, 1996) discloses a respective trustworthiness measure and a respective criticality measure assigned to service components.
9. However, neither Wiegel nor Pleeger disclose "assigning to each service component a respective trustworthiness measure and a respective criticality measure; for each service component, using the trustworthiness and criticality measures assigned to the service component so as to determine one or more of the processing nodes onto which the service component should be programmed, programming each service component onto the one or more processing node determined to be the one or more processing nodes onto which the service component should be programmed; based on the identity of at least one of the service components, establishing access control logic restricting inter-node communication involving the at least one service component; programming the external entity with the access-control logic; at the external entity, receiving from the interconnection system a signal indicating detection of an attempted inter-node communication involving the at least one service component; in response to receiving the signal, the external entity providing at least a portion of the access-control logic provided to the interconnection system, to block the attempted inter-node communication involving the at least one service component, wherein the trustworthiness measure for each service component represents an assessment of a potential threat the service component poses to

other object, and wherein the criticality measure for each service component represents a measure of concern for what the other objects may do to the service component.

10. Introducing these limitations would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The prior art, fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitation of applicant's independent claims, in such a manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 would be proper. As a result the claimed invention is considered to be in condition for allowance as being novel and non-obvious over prior art.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on statement of Reasons for Allowance".

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Poltorak whose telephone number is (571) 272-3840. The examiner can normally be reached from Monday through Thursday from 9:00 until 5:00, and every other Friday from 9:00 until 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis Jacques can be reached on (571)272-6962. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)

273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

G. Barron
10/13/06

Gilberto Barron Jr.
GILBERTO BARRON Jr.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100